

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 In re QLIANCE MEDICAL GROUP OF
WASHINGTON, PC,

NO. C19-1960MJP

9 Debtor.

10
11 EDMUND J. WOOD, as Trustee for the
Estate,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO APPEAL

12 Plaintiff/Appellee,

13 v.

14 COORDINATED CARE CORPORATION,

15 Defendant/Appellant.
16
17


18 This matter comes before the Court on Coordinated Care Corporation's "Motion for
19 Leave to Appeal Under 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3) and a Stay Pending Resolution of the Appeal."
20 Dkt. # 1-2.¹ In determining whether to grant leave to appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3), courts
21 "look for guidance to standards developed under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) . . . even though the
22

23
24 ¹ The motion for leave to appeal was ostensibly filed on behalf of both Coordinated Care
25 Corporation and Coordinated Care of Washington, Inc. The Trustee's claims against the latter company
26 were dismissed by the Bankruptcy Court on September 19, 2019, however, and the order on appeal runs
27 solely against Coordinated Care Corporation. *See Wood v. Coordinated Care Corporation, et al.*,
Adversary Proceeding No. 19-1081CMA, Dkt. # 25 and # 34. To the extent Coordinated Care of
Washington, Inc., seeks leave to appeal, the request is DENIED.

1 procedure is somewhat different.” *In re Belli*, 268 B.R. 851, 858 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2001). Leave to
2 appeal in this context “should not be granted unless refusal would result in wasted litigation and
3 expense, the appeal involves a controlling question of law as to which there is a substantial
4 ground for difference of opinion, and an immediate appeal would materially advance the
5 ultimate termination of the litigation.” *In re NSB Film Corp.*, 167 B.R. 176, 180 (B.A.P. 9th Cir.
6 1994). *See also In re GACN, Inc.*, 555 B.R. 684, 692 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2016).

8 The undersigned recently amended the discharge order in *Coordinated Care Corporation*
9 *v. Qliance Medical Group of Washington, PC*, C17-1180MJP, on which Coordinated Care
10 Corporation’s appeal is based. In light of the amendment, there is no reasonable, much less
11 substantial, ground for disagreement with the bankruptcy court’s findings that the Adversary
12 Action is not barred by either the discharge order or the doctrine of res judicata. Leave to appeal
13 is therefore DENIED.

15
16 DATED this _31st_ day of _March_, 2020.

18
19 
20 Marsha J. Pechman
21 United States District Judge